

Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



Minutes of Meeting

Date held: April 23, 2014	Time held: 9:00 am – 11:00 am	Location held: Webinar
Company Name	Attended	Attendance Status (A)ttended
Brighton Beach Power	Little, Dave	A
Bruce Power	Villegas, Gabriel	A
Bruce Power	Hodgson, Rick	A
Capital Power Corporation	Dewar, Doug	A
Cochrane Power	White, Bruce	A
GDF Suez Canada	Bauder, Donald	A
Gerdau	Simmons, Dave	A
Goreway Station Partnership	Maddix, Melanie	A
Greenfield Energy Centre	Michieli, Peter	A
Hydro One	Boudreau, Ryan	A
Hydro One	Chayka, Darin	A
Hydro One	Karjanmaa, Ginette	A
Kingston Generating Station	Donnelly, Keith	A
Ontario Power Generation	Eckensweiler, Dave	A
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	A
Portlands Energy Centre	Rouhi, Amir	A
IESO	Duru, Josh	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Harrison, Susan	A
IESO	Johnson, Len	A
IESO	Muzahid, Tanjil	A

All meeting material is available on the IESO web site at:

<http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Stakeholder-Engagement/SE-109.aspx>

Item 1 Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks

Susan Harrison welcomed the attendees to the Outage Management Process Redesign Consultation (SE-109) meeting.

Item 2 Review of Final Process Redesign

Mark Gojmerac opened up the presentation by reviewing the details of the Final Process Redesign that was developed with stakeholders midway through 2013.

The following are questions that were asked during the presentation by stakeholders along with the IESO's responses (in italics):

A member asked if new planned outage request submissions would still be accepted after the submission deadline of the proposed Quarterly Adv. Approval process.

The IESO responded that new planned outage requests would be accepted; however they would not be assessed until the start of either the weekly or daily assessment processes.

A member asked what will happen if a change needs to be made to an outage request at any point in its lifecycle.

Pending a complete understanding of the vendor's software capabilities, the IESO responded that changes required during an assessment period are prohibited unless agreed to by the IESO (i.e. in the interests of conflict resolution and providing outages adv. approval). However, the market participant could always cancel the outage request being assessed and submit a new request. Outside of an assessment period, the market participant should be able to make as many changes as they wish, however material changes would be treated as a new submission and subject to submission criteria and lead times.

A member asked what the relevance of the "At Risk" status is in the Quarterly Adv. Approval and how it is different from the 18 month "At Risk" status.

The IESO responded that At Risk statuses within either the Quarterly or 18 Month processes are similar in that they are intended to inform the participant that their outage is at risk of not being Adv Approved, but can still be considered for Adv Approval in the near term process. For this reason, the IESO proposes removing the At Risk declarations from the 18 Month process once the Quarterly process is implemented.

A member asked why non-critical outages with an "At Risk" declaration would not be forwarded through to daily assessment processes if it could not be Adv. Approved in the Weekly process.

Given its current understanding of the preferred vendors' software capabilities, the IESO responded that At Risk outages, along with any new submissions received prior to the start of the Weekly Adv. Approval process would either be Adv Approved or Rejected during the weekly process (i.e. there may not be a software option to defer to the daily process for a non-critical outage). The market participant would still have the opportunity to resubmit a rejection into the Daily process as an opportunity outage or by utilizing the 5 business day grace period for timestamp retention upon resubmission of a rejected outage.

A member asked whether they can leave the outage request in the queue that was deemed to be “At Risk” during the Quarterly Adv. Approval.

The IESO responded that the market participant can leave the request in the At Risk state and it would still be assessed again during the Weekly Adv. Approval process.

A member pointed out that their company usually looks at the market one day in advance and may have an opportunity to proceed with an outage if market conditions are ‘soft’. The member was wondering if these outage requests will have to be classified as “Urgent” outage requests in order to get their outages assessed after the submission lead times for planned outages.

The IESO responded that “Urgent” outage requests are considered a subset of forced outages and intended to only be used for non-discretionary work. The IESO suggested that, pending further stakeholder feedback on the current daily process rules, market participants might be able to utilize “Opportunity” outage requests to take advantage of favourable day ahead market conditions.

Item 3 Request for Proposal (RFP) Outcomes

After reviewing the Final Process Redesign, Mark Gojmerac described some of the preferred vendor’s software capabilities.

The following are questions that were asked during the presentation by stakeholders along with the IESO’s responses (in italics):

A member asked whether multiple recall times applied to the entire duration of the outage request or whether they could be applied to multiple time periods within the outage request.

The IESO responded that they still have to further discuss the extent of this functionality with the vendor.

A member asked whether “Proposed” state was mandatory.

The IESO responded that it is not.

A member asked about the reporting capabilities of the preferred vendors’ software.

The IESO responded that further discussion is required to fully understand the reporting capabilities.

A member asked what would happen to an Adv. Approved outage request that was moved to the “Negotiate” status.

The IESO responded that “Negotiate” status will allow the market participant to make changes to the outage request without affecting time-stamp priority (at IESO discretion).

A member asked whether the market participants would have to provide the actual start and end dates for an outage request.

The IESO responded that the market participant will be permitted and required to input that information once the outage request has received Final Approval from the IESO.

A member asked if a final decision has been made on what outage request attributes will be included in the software.

The IESO responded that a final decision has not been made however the IESO is confident that the new software will support all of the attributes used in the existing software. Any new attributes the IESO believes should be included will be presented to stakeholders at a future meeting.

A member asked if the new software would require an end time in order to transition the outage request from the "In-Progress" state to the "Recall" or "Completed" state.

The IESO responded that these state transition details would have to be further discussed with the vendor.

A member asked if the new system will be integrated with the IESO's dispatching software.

The IESO responded yes.

A member asked how they would submit a Forced outage request ahead of time (i.e. hours or days before the anticipated start time).

The IESO responded that an "Urgent" outage request we be available for these situations.

A member asked what the lead times for an "Urgent" outage request would be.

The IESO responded that an "Urgent" outage requests will not have a lead time.

A member asked if a small extension to the outage request needs to be reported.

The IESO responded that all extensions need to be reported, however whether the extension needs to be reflected in the software would be at the discretion of the IESO (i.e. a 15 minute delay may not be required if no adverse impact to the dispatching software is anticipated). These situations should be discussed between the market participant and the IESO on a case by case basis.

Item 4 Proposed Assessment Methodologies

After introducing the preferred vendors' software capabilities Mark Gojmerac moved on to present the Proposed Capacity Assessment Methodologies for the Quarterly Process.

The following are questions that were asked during the presentation by stakeholders along with the IESO's responses (in italics):

A member asked if 'Transmission Outage Requests that Bottle Generation' are included in the current assessment processes and how the timestamps of the transmission outages are used in alleviating potential shortfalls.

The IESO responded that transmission outage requests that bottle generation are captured in the current assessment processes. If a shortfall is identified, all outages (generation or transmission) contributing to the shortfall are identified in order of timestamp priority. Outages with lower priority (poorer) timestamps are either Rejected or placed At Risk (depending on the process) first.

A member asked what would be considered to be a part of the Available Resources for assessment.

The IESO responded that the planned or firm resources from the 18 month process will not be considered as 'Available Resources'. This approach is in line with the existing near term adv. approval process.

Item 5 Review Action Items and Next Steps

Mark Gojmerac reviewed next steps which included seeking feedback from stakeholders via questions that will be provided to guide input and the next meeting date of May 28. (Note to Minutes: Due to scheduling conflicts, the next meeting was rescheduled to June 4.)

The meeting then adjourned.